

Science and Faith

Questions

- are dangers involved for Christians studying science?
- if so, what are they?
- if so, what can we do about the risks?

- how does history and our society paint the progress of science and religion?
- in this popular view of the history of science what role has Christianity played?
- do your friends or relatives have the same impressions?
- what about yourself?
- how would you respond to those that claim that science and faith do not overlap?
- what about those that claim that science is rational and faith is irrational?
- how much respect does science have today as accurately seeking truth?

- what does the Christian view of God and his revelation tell us about science?
- has a Christian view on science ever proven to be incorrect?
- what about correct?
- in your opinion does science ever claim to know more than it does?
- does the media portray a friendly or unfriendly relationship between science and religion?
- if negative, why?

- what is science?
- what is the proper way to do science?
- are all sciences equally verifiable?

- are there any limits to what science can explore?
- are there any biases or self-imposed limits present in modern science?
- can Christians participate fully in science?
- should science allow for supernatural involvement/interference?
- if not, will it be able to fully investigate reality?

- do miracles in the Bible violate science?
- what about Bible miracles -- were they commonplace?
- what role/purpose did biblical miracles serve?
- do miracles occur in our time?
- if so, how should we approach them scientifically?

- what opinions do Christians have re: the origin of the universe, earth, and mankind?
- which ones do you have?
- how firm are you in your opinions?
- what led you to your current opinions?

- is there any scientific evidence to support the existence of God?

- is the evidence for God just evidence or is it proof?
- would/should God leave any scientific evidence of his existence?
- have you heard of the "fine tuning" theory?
- do you think that it provides evidence for a Creator?
- how do you think atheists react to this theory?
- what do you think of the "multiverse" theory?
- does this theory eliminate the need for a Creator?
- does it eliminate the evidence for a Creator?
- what have you read or been told about how special our Earth/Sun/Moon/solar system/galaxy is?
- what does science and the media tell us about life in our solar system or outside of it?
- do you think the universe is old enough and large enough to account for us and other life?
- what is your perception of how complex life is?
- have you heard of the "divine watchmaker" analogy?
- do you think that life shows evidence of Intelligent Design?
- what does the word "evolution" mean to you?
- do you believe that science has proved evolution to be true?
- are there any problems with the theory of evolution that you know of?
- is it fair to claim God's involvement when science has a gap in its theories?
- when discussing origins with non-believers (laymen or scientists) what should you pay attention to?
- what are some errors in logic that you should be watching for and correcting?
- do you believe in a literal Adam/Eve?
- if so, did they live recently (thousands) or a long time ago?
- were there other humans around, and were they specially chosen by God?
- were there proto-humans around, and God put his spark of divinity in them?
- do you believe in molecular evolution?
- do you believe in macro-evolution?
- did God supernaturally participate in evolution?
- did God design the universe to be self-assembling?
- did God show his supernatural involvement with life via ID?
- did death in nature occur before the Fall?
- was there a world-wide flood?
- did God create viruses?

GOOD BOOKS

The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism [Timothy Keller] Chapter 6: Science Has Disproved Christianity
 Busted: Exposing Popular Myths About Christianity [Fred von Kamecke] Chapter 4: Science has proven that miracles don't happen (so the Bible is a fairytale)
 Beyond Opinion [Ravi Zacharias] Chapter 6: Challenges From Science [John Lennox]
 Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds [Phillip E. Johnson]

BAD BOOKS

Richard Dawkins:

The God Delusion

The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design

The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution

The Selfish Gene

Climbing Mount Improbable

Christopher Hitchens:

God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything
Is Christianity Good for the World?

Sam Harris:

Letter to a Christian Nation

The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason

Daniel Dennett:

Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon

Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life

Victor Stenger:

The New Atheism: Taking a Stand for Science and Reason

BAD QUOTES

Richard Dawkins:

"It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)."

"Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose"

"I am against religion because it teaches us to be satisfied with not understanding the world."

"Faith is the great cop-out, the great excuse to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence. Faith is the belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence."

"The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind pitiless indifference."

"To an honest judge, the alleged convergence between religion and science is a

shallow, empty, hollow, spin-doctored sham."

"The universe is nothing but a collection of atoms in motion, human beings are simply machines for propagating DNA, and the propagation of DNA is a self-sustaining process. It is every living object's sole reason for living."

Christopher Hitchens:

"The Bible may, indeed does, contain a warrant for trafficking in humans, for ethnic cleansing, for slavery, for bride-price, and for indiscriminate massacre, but we are not bound by any of it because it was put together by crude, uncultured human mammals."

"The only position that leaves me with no cognitive dissonance is atheism. It is not a creed. Death is certain, replacing both the siren-song of Paradise and the dread of Hell. Life on this earth, with all its mystery and beauty and pain, is then to be lived far more intensely: we stumble and get up, we are sad, confident, insecure, feel loneliness and joy and love. There is nothing more; but I want nothing more."

Sam Harris:

"Tell a devout Christian that his wife is cheating on him, or that frozen yogurt can make a man invisible, and he is likely to require as much evidence as anyone else, and to be persuaded only to the extent that you give it. Tell him that the book he keeps by his bed was written by an invisible deity who will punish him with fire for eternity if he fails to accept its every incredible claim about the universe, and he seems to require no evidence what so ever."

"Every one of the world's "great" religions utterly trivializes the immensity and beauty of the cosmos. Books like the Bible and the Koran get almost every significant fact about us and our world wrong. Every scientific domain -- from cosmology to psychology to economics -- has superseded and surpassed the wisdom of Scripture.

Everything of value that people get from religion can be had more honestly, without presuming anything on insufficient evidence. The rest is self-deception, set to music."

"It is also worth noting that one can obtain a Ph.D. in any branch of science for no other purpose than to make cynical use of scientific language in an effort to rationalize the glaring inadequacies of the Bible. A handful of Christians appear to have done this; some have even obtained their degrees from reputable universities. No doubt, others will follow in their footsteps. While such people are technically "scientists," they are not behaving like scientists. They simply are not engaged in an honest inquiry into the nature of the universe. And their proclamations about God and the failures of Darwinism do not in the least signify that there is a legitimate scientific controversy about evolution."

"A person can be a God-fearing Christian on Sunday and a working scientist come Monday morning, without ever having to account for the partition that seems to have erected itself in his head while he slept."

Daniel Dennett:

"The kindly God who lovingly fashioned each and every one of us and sprinkled the sky with shining stars for our delight -- that God is, like Santa Claus, a myth of childhood, not anything a sane, undeluded adult could literally believe in. That

God must either be turned into a symbol for something less concrete or abandoned altogether."

Jerry Coyne:

"My Dear Mr. Darwin, Happy 200th birthday! I hope you are as well as can be expected for someone who has been dead for nearly 130 years.

...
I wish I could end this letter by telling you that your theory of evolution has achieved universal acceptance. As you well knew, evolution has proved a bitter pill for religious people to swallow. For example, a large proportion of the American public, despite access to education, clings to a belief in the literal truth of Genesis. You will find this hard to believe, but more Americans believe in the existence of heavenly angels than accept the fact of evolution. Unfortunately, I must often put aside my research to fight the attempts of these "creationists" to have their Biblical views taught in the public schools. Humans have evolved extraordinary intellectual abilities, but sadly these are not always given a free rein by their owners. But this probably won't surprise you – remember the Bishop of Oxford and his attempt to put your friend Thomas H. Huxley in his place?"

PZ Myers:

"We go right to the central issue of whether there is a god or not. We're pretty certain that if there were an all-powerful being pulling the strings and shaping history for the benefit of human beings, the universe would look rather different than it does."

GOOD QUOTES

David Heddle

"The gospel is a gospel of faith that the blood of Christ atones for your sins and makes you acceptable before a holy God. It is not a gospel of the end times or the beginning times."

"Fine tuning refers to sensitivity, not improbability. It makes no claim about the probability of the constants."

Robert Jastrow

"For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries."

Sean Pitman

"The strength of the scientific method is found not so much in its ability to detect truth, but in its ability to detect error. It has the ability to rule out those hypothesis and theories that are definitely wrong."

William Paley

"In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there; I might possibly answer, that, for anything I knew

to the contrary, it had lain there forever: nor would it perhaps be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place; I should hardly think of the answer I had before given, that for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there. (...) There must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers, who formed [the watch] for the purpose which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use. (...) Every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature; with the difference, on the side of nature, of being greater or more, and that in a degree which exceeds all computation."

". . . when we come to inspect the watch, we perceive. . . that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose, e.g. that they are so formed and adjusted as to produce motion, and that motion so regulated as to point out the hour of the day; that if the different parts had been differently shaped from what they are, or placed after any other manner or in any other order than that in which they are placed, either no motion at all would have been carried on in the machine, or none which would have answered the use that is now served by it. . . . the inference we think is inevitable, that the watch must have had a maker -- that there must have existed, at some time and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose which we find it actually to answer, who comprehended its construction and designed its use."

GOOD SITES/GROUPS

Old Earth Creationism (OEC):

Reasons to Believe (RTB) [Hugh Ross]
Evidence for God [Richard Deem]
Answers in Creation (AIC) [Greg Neyman]
Origin Science [Mark Bradford]
American Scientific Affiliation (ASA) [Randy Isaac]
BeThinking [UCCF]

Intelligent Design (ID):

Discovery Institute: Center for Science and Culture (CSC) [Stephen Meyer, Mark Hartwig, Jay Richards, etc]
Intelligent Design and Evolution Awareness Center (IDEA) [Michael Behe, Willian Dembski, Phillip Johnson, Jonathan Wells, Mark Hartwig, Jay Richards, etc]
Access Research Network (ARN) [Dennis Wagner, Steven Meyer, Mark Hartwig, Paul Nelson, etc]

Young Earth Creationism (YEC):

Institute for Creation Research (ICR) [Henry Morris]
Answers in Genesis (AIG) [Ken Ham]
Creation Evolution Headlines [Bible Science Association]
Creation Ministries International (CMI) [Carl Wieland]
Creation Research Society (CRS) [?]
Creation Science Evangelism [Kent Hovind]

Theistic Evolutionism (TE) aka Evolutionary Creationism (EC)

Biologos Foundation [Francis Collins]

Beyond the Firmament [Gordon Glover]

BAD SITES/GROUPS

Talk.Origins

National Center for Science Education (NCSE) [Barbara Forrest, Eugenie Scott, etc]

RichardDawkins.net [Richard Dawkins]

OTHER GOOD PEOPLE

Time Keller

William Lane Craig

Alister McGrath

John Polkinghorne

John Ankergerg

RC Sproul

Ravi Zacharias

Norman Geisler

Lee Strobel

DANGERS OF INVESTIGATION

- having one of your theologically-based beliefs regarding origins challenged and/or overturned by science can (and sometimes does) cause personal crisis and ultimately a rejection of theistic belief.
- also danger of "hitching our wagon" too closely to a particular scientist or scientific theory
- above all, you must accept that God is behind all supernatural *and* nature mechanisms in our Universe.

CREATION THEORIES (BASIC)

Young Earth Creation (YEC)

Old Earth Creationism (OEC)

[Intelligent Design (ID)]

Theistic Evolution (TE)

HISTORY OF SCIENCE: MYTH

- time when world and starry heavens were richly populated with various gods
- gods were responsible for all good and bad things in life
- people needed to appease the gods
- judaism and christianity did the same but were a natural evolution towards monotheism
- primitive people sought solice of religion since:
 - : they lacked skills for critical thinking
 - : they lacked tools to examine the reality beyond their experience
- miracles were just the outworking of the laws of nature

- people needed the light of reason and clarity of thought to deliver them from superstitions
- the shift finally occurred in the 17th/18th century with the Enlightenment
 - : man (instead of God) became measure of all things
 - : time of discovery/invention/speculation
 - : conviction that there was no God/afterlife/miracles/heaven/hell
 - : all that exists was the natural order and observable universe
 - : gods no longer necessary to explain nature
 - : any appeal to supernatural is superstition
 - : rationalism and logical precision was now required
 - : modern science is now the result
- this myth has now become part of our culture
- if something cannot be proven scientifically it isn't valid
- I won't believe it until I see it
- science is based on facts
- christianity is based on faith:
 - : fit only for weak and gullible
 - : crutch for those who cannot handle the facts

HISTORY OF SCIENCE: TRUTH

- modern science descended from Christian worldview
 - : universe is intelligible
 - : God is a God of order
 - : universe has laws that are visible
 - : as beings in God's image we can understand that order
 - : only one God so consistency of laws and physics throughout the universe (i.e. monotheism)
 - : no inherent problem in intervention periodically i.e. miracles
- mediaeval insistence on the rationality of God
- "Men became scientific because they expected law in nature, and they expected law in nature because they believed in a lawgiver"
- wrong ideas about science are driven by outmoded notions on the 19th century
 - : mechanistic/deterministic universe
 - : compared to a clock -- static/unchanging/predictable
 - : universe could be precisely mathematically described
 - : universe was eternal
- these ideas changed radically in the 20th century
 - : universe had a beginning -- contrary to what naturalists desired
 - : universe is expanding and accelerating
 - : so not static nor eternal
 - : this raises a lot of questions about the universe
- quantum physics is an example of this unpredictability
 - : the universe does not act the same way at subatomic scale
 - : cannot determine both the position and speed of particles -- uncertainty principle
 - : so our ability to comprehend and accurately describe our natural world has serious limits
- we are finite creatures with finite minds
- what we need is trustworthy experts in science
 - : who understand responsibility to give expertise
 - : who do not claim to know more than they do

WHY THIS MODEL OF CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY?

- common belief says so
- media presents stories with protagonists/antagonists (good guys vs bad guys)
- this gives credibility to either science/rational *or* religious
- conflict model was part of cultural strategy by scientists and educational leaders at end of 19th century to undermine church control of institutions
- however faith of scientists hasn't really changed that much in 80 years

DEFINITIONS OF SCIENCE

- scientific method:
 - : observation
 - : hypothesis
 - : experiments with strict controls to test hypothesis
 - : reject or refine hypothesis
 - : repeat experiments to build theory
 - : reviews and experiments by peers to establish fact
- however there is a difference between experimental and historical sciences
 - : evidence proceeding from an acceptance of mainstream science e.g. physics/chemistry/biology
 - : evidence that calls into question certain aspects of mainstream science e.g. geology/archaeology/paleontology and especially evolution
- a precise definition of science is elusive e.g. not all experiments are repeatable
- historical scientists look for the best attempt at explaining what occurred in the past resulting in what we see today
- we need to follow where the evidence leads

LIMITS OF SCIENCE

- science is the means the physical universe is explained and explored
- its tools are designed to measure/quantify/identify/investigate only the natural realm
- science is only equipped to test for normal causes
- it cannot say anything about the supernatural realm
- it also will not perceive spiritual intervention (but what about ID?)
- many important aspects of reality are outside realm of science
- science cannot answer questions of ultimate purpose -- but it cannot dismiss it
- reason is not opposed to revelation -- reason is required to evaluate revelation
- revelation does not mean reason has stopped or evidence has become irrelevant

SCIENCE VS PHILOSOPHY

- science cannot claim that no other causes could possibly exist but this idea itself is untestable so this is philosophy
- e.g. drunk looking for car keys under streetlight but also insisting that they must be there
- also hidden premise by some that since miracles cannot happen that God doesn't exist

- this shows the close connection between science and philosophy
- many people cross this line without realizing it
- belief that scientific discovery is able to account for everything in the natural realm
- claiming that science has not yet proven something reveals the idea as faith and not science
- this is not science -- the end result of reasoned argument with scientific proofs

METHODOLOGICAL NATURALISM

- metaphysical naturalism assumes that the supernatural does not exist at all
- methodological naturalism (MN) assumes that only natural processes are in effect while doing science
- this mostly works OK but creates problems when encountering miracles
- realism is the view that science aims at discovering objective truths about reality
- methodological naturalism is opposed to realism because it violates the principles of discovery, evidence, and self-correction
- methodological neutralism would be a better principle for science to follow
- scientists must always be willing to consider opposing evidence

MIRACLES VS SCIENCE

- mistaken belief that miracles were an everyday occurrence in the Bible
- however sometimes there were gaps of centuries between miracles
- also occurred in different locations including rural or in private
- even doubt was present for Jesus's miracles
- so it is not just modern scientific people that struggle
- purpose of not just cognitive belief but worship/awe/wonder
- used by Jesus to heal/feed/resurrect
- Jesus's miracles did not suspend natural order -- but to restore it
- God gets to select what/when/where of miracles
- claiming science has disproven miracles is an unexamined assertion with no proof offered
 - : who performed the experiment?
 - : what was the nature of the experiment?
 - : when and where was it carried out?
 - : under what conditions/controls/variables?
 - : what scientific journal was it recorded in?
 - : who did the peer review?
 - : who reported and confirmed the experiment?
- this reveals that the claim is philosophy and not science
- science cannot say that miracles did/do not occur -- only that they have witnessed none
- we should not be surprised if we don't see them everyday and everywhere
- it is OK to be skeptical and use tools to investigate miracles today

SCIENTIFIC BALONEY DETECTOR

- selective use of evidence
- appeals to authority

- ad homineum arguments
- begging the question
- straw man arguments
- begging the question
- lack of testability
- vague terms and shifting definitions (equivocation)
- believing what you want to believe
- either/or fallacy
- complex/loaded question

SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE FOR FAITH

- must realize that this is evidence -- not proof
- some Christians believe that no scientific evidence exists for God or his creative acts
- the lists below are a tiny fraction of those that are available!
- fine tuning the universe for life

PHYSICAL CONSTANTS i.e. many fundamental constants of nature have just the right values for life to exist

: Ratio of Electrons:Protons formation] (p150 in 'Creator and the Cosmos')	= 1:10**37 [no galaxy/star/planet
: Ratio of Electromagnetic Force:Gravity	= 1:10**40
: Expansion Rate of Universe galaxies]	= 1:10**55 [collapse of universe or no
: Mass of Universe1	= 1:10**59 [flatness problem]
: Cosmological Constant	= 1:10**120

- for comparison:

: number of cells in human body	10**14
: number of grains of sand in the world	10*22
: number of stars in the universe	10**22
: number of atoms in the universe	10**80

- this is not a question of probability -- but of suitability for life
- fine tuning is not disputed -- but it forces either design or incredible luck
- some attempts to avoid this overwhelming fine tuning is multiverse theory
- multiverse theory assumes infinite parallel universes exist where anything theoretically possible is ultimately actualized
- but this just increases problem of fine tuning at another level
- also not science since not testable
- multiverse is strong evidence for design on its own

LOCATION OF EARTH IN UNIVERSE i.e. Goldilocks Zone

: galactic habitable zone (GHZ) [away from the center, in the spaces between the arms of the spiral i.e. heavy elements, radiation, etc]
: circumstellar habitable zone (CHZ) [right distance from sun for liquid water]
: also they need to remain in this state long enough i.e. continuously habitable zone
: also Earth needed to form during cosmic habitable age (CHA) -- the period during which a universe can be inhabited -- life cannot form in a cosmos before atoms have formed, or after the stars have burned out

right kind of galaxy 1:15
 right place in galaxy 1:10000
 right kind of star 1:1000
 right distance of planet 1:40
 right sized planet 1:10
 right spin of planet 1:5
 not near a black hole 1:100
 proper magnetic field 1:10
 high composition of carbon 1:1000
 high water content 1:1000

COMPLEXITY OF LIFE

: this is more controversial -- ID vs id -- so theistic evolutionists do not accept it -- just IDs

: universal agreement that living world gives overwhelming impression of design
 : simply because we do not know the function of the parts does not imply that there is no function

: the simplest self-replicating peptide is only 32 amino acids long -- the probability of it forming randomly in sequential trials is approximately 1 in 10^{40} (atheist claim!)

: the odds of even one simple protein molecule forming by chance are 1 in 10^{113} -- and thousands of different proteins are needed to form life

: scientists admit probability of life is low but claim that once it started natural selection was assured of evolving intelligent life given enough time

: DNA is so complex that "there is enough information capacity in a single human cell to store the Encyclopaedia Britannica, all 30 volumes of it, three or four times over" (Dawkins!)

i.e. about 750mb of data

: Dawkins claims:

- biological evolution is incompatible with existence of a Creator
- biological evolution accounts for existence of all life's complexity

: but he confuses mechanism (evolution) for agency (God)

e.g. humans making cars vs humans making robots making cars

- claims that natural selection can somehow design without having been designed itself

: living cells are not just "matter" but also "information"

: unguided natural processes cannot create information

: Anthony Flew became converted from atheism to deism due to DNA complexity "A super-intelligence is the only good explanation for the origin of life and the complexity of nature, Flew said ... biologists' investigation of DNA `has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce (life), that intelligence must have been involved"

: evolution has different meanings:

- unguided/guided
- macro/micro
- molecular -- living cells from non-living materials

: Cambrian Explosion

- there of the relatively rapid appearance over a period of many million years of most major groups of complex animals around 530 million years ago

- no transient forms discovered

- not mentioned in many biology textbooks

- even Dawkins sees the problem "we find many of them [Cambrian fossils] already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists"

: Drake equation (7 factors) attempts to predict the number of intelligent

civilizations in the milky way galaxy

: current estimates range wildly from a lot to 5 or 2 -- but it assumes that a planet with appropriate conditions for life is 100% guaranteed to produce intelligent life

: Hugh Ross adds more components (128 factors) to the equation and calculates $1:10^{144}$ for habitable planet in entire universe -- never mind intelligent life

INTELLIGENT DESIGN (ID)

- life consists of matter/chemicals AND information
- information is not reducible to matter
- complex specified information cannot be produced by chance
- irreducible complexity (IC) in molecular mechanisms is an example of ID
e.g. bacterial flagellum, eye, etc.
- it is not necessary to show that something is perfect in order to show that there is a design
- but not all accept Intelligent Design (ID) but do accept intelligent design

GOD OF THE GAPS

- evidence of God is in the stuff we understand -- not just where we don't
- God is not an alternative to science
- bad gaps are gaps that science can/will close and we should not use e.g. Newton claiming God tweaks planet orbits
- good gaps are gaps that science opens willingly and we should use e.g. writing on paper
- origin science is an area where there are good gaps
- so "God of the Gaps" is sometimes appropriate

REDUCTIONISM

- methodological reductionism -- studying the parts -- is normal for science
- ontological reductionism -- whole is just the sum of its parts -- goes too far and claims parts is all there is -- so it goes beyond science
- so concludes wrongly that love, fear, concepts of beauty and truth are meaningless

ISSUES IN BELIEF

- common descent/ancestry or not?
- literal Adam/Eve or not?
- old earth with old Adam or young Adam?
- supernatural involvement in evolution or not? (depends whether "evolution" means "undirected" or not)

CRITICAL THINKING IN EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY

- learn to distinguish between what scientists assume and what they investigate

- learn to use terms precisely and consistently
- keep your eye on the mechanism of evolution
- learn the difference between testing a theory against evidence vs using selected bits of evidence to support a theory
- learn the difference between intelligent and unintelligent causes
- learn to deal with the problem of suffering
- learn to deal with the problem of faith

PERSONAL HISTORY

- Young-Earth Creationism (YEC) till my 30's (?)
- special lectures in MAC by YEC scientist as teenager
- books offered/read:

The Remarkable Birth of the Planet Earth (Henry Morris) 1972 ICR
 Evolution: Its Collapse in View? (Henry Hiebert) 1979
 Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter (Robert Kofahl) 1980 CRI

- attended UoM from 1980-1984
- discovered that UoM professor who attended my church was evolutionist
- found out about Hugh Ross books:

Beyond The Cosmos 1999 (Hugh Ross) RTB
 The Creator and the Cosmos (Hugh Ross) 2001 RTB
 Why the Universe is the Way It Is (Hugh Ross) 2008 RTB

- converted to Old-Earth Creationist (OEC) viewpoint
- also started studying Intelligent Design (ID)
 Science and Evidence for Design in the Universe (Michael Behe, William Demski, Stephen Meyer) 2000
 The Privileged Planet (Guillermo Gonzalez, Jay Richards) 2004

- now trying to discern intelligibility/validity of ID in context of OEC
- also exploring Theistic Evolution (TE) and limits of integration with my Christian worldview